

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 4 and 6 through 14 remain in this application. Claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended.

Claims 1, 7 and 13 are objected to for including the term "if" without reciting what would happen otherwise. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are hereby amended as indicated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1, 7 and 13 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 4 and 6 through 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0046299 to Lefeber, et al. (Lefeber hereafter) and U.S. Patent No. US 6,493,744 to Emens, et al. (Emens hereafter).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Lefeber and Emens in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0182391 to Leber, et al. (Leber hereafter).

Independent claims 1, 7 and 13 as amended provide, *inter alia*, the rule set comprises a plurality of rules, each of which relates to a respective predetermined message content, at least one rule of the plurality of rules being associated with a particular local requirement. Support for the above added recitation is provided at page 3, lines 15 through 27, of the specification

In contrast, Lefeber, Emens and Leber, individually or in combination, do not describe or suggest at least one rule of a plurality of rules that is associated with a particular local requirement, as required by claims 1, 7, and 13 as amended. Therefore, claims 1, 7 and 13 distinguish patentably from Lefeber, Emens, Leber, and the suggestion combination of these references.

Claims 2 through 4, 6, 8 through 12 and 14 depend from and include all limitations of claims 1, 7 and 13 as amended. Therefore, claims 2 through 4, 6, 8 through 12 and 14 distinguish patentably from Lefeber, Emens, Leber, and the suggestion combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claims 1, 7 and 13 above.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 4 and 6 through 14 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

/HISASHI D. WATANABE/ 02/26/2010
Hisashi D. Watanabe Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350